

REMARKS

Applicants have thoroughly considered the Examiner's remarks in the April 13, 2009 Final Office Action. Simultaneously with the filing of this Response, Applicants have filed a notice of appeal.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicants thank the Examiner for the Interview of July 8, 2009. Applicants generally discussed the rejection of the dependent claims. The Examiner suggested that he would call the Applicants after further review of the Final Office Action. No agreement was reached.

WITHDRAWAL OF FINAL OFFICE ACTION

Applicants request that the final Office Action be withdrawn due to incompleteness. In the final Office Action, the Examiner fails to address each and every claim. Instead, the Office merely provides arguments to reject the independent claims without providing any basis for rejecting the dependent claims. Applicants made a similar request in Amendment A filed October 19, 2007 (Page 11 of Amendment A as filed), which went unaddressed and without correction in the subsequent Office Actions that were issued by the Examiner. Furthermore, the Office actions additionally fail to even address each independent claim separately, as exemplified by the latest Office Action.

Applicants have filed a notice of appeal. Applicants submit that the Examiner should specify the reasons for the rejection of each independent claim and each dependent claim so that Applicants can address the rejections on appeal.

In addition, in the final Office Action, the Examiner indicates (Page 5, paragraph 1 of Office Action) that "to overcome the examiners current prior art rejection, the examiner suggests the following be amended in the all independent claims.....Applicants must also understand that any amendment to the claims will require further reconsideration and search at any future prosecution in the application." As part of the suggestions, the Examiner proceeds to recite the aspects for inclusion in the amended claims. Applicants thank the Examiner for the suggestions. However,

Applicants are unable to evaluate the suggestions without a full understanding of the basis for rejecting the dependent claims because at least some of the suggestions are already pending in the present application. Thus, Applicants are at a loss as to why the claims which recite the suggested subject matter have not been addressed and allowed. In particular, the Examiner suggests the following (Applicants comments in italics):

- "claim 20" - *This subject matter is hence already claimed and should have been previously examined and addressed in the Office action.*
- "language of paragraph [0020], specifically dealing with central server, first policy group and second policy group, a database containing the first policy group and second policy group that is coupled to the central server" - *The language of paragraph [0020] is already recited at least in part in independent claim 30 of the Applicant's claims and, thus, should have been previously examined and addressed in the Office action.*

It is unclear why additional searching will be needed with regard to the above noted aspects since these aspects are already recited in the claims as stated above and have been previously presented. If the Examiner has made a detailed search commensurate with the limitations appearing in **the most detailed claims** in the case (per MPEP 904.03), further searching should be unnecessary if the stated language is allowable subject matter.

The Examiner also recites the following aspects: "0043, the 64-bit PUID that is encrypted, 0073, after the user is authenticated by the central server, the user is only allowed to use the requested service for a predefined window of time". Paragraph [0073] of Specification as filed does not recite the stated language.

Applicants further submit that the recitals of using encrypted identifiers and time-out based session cookies cannot be reasonably evaluated in light of previously unaddressed subject matter recited in the claims, and reiterate their request for a detailed claim analysis by the Examiner.

As noted above, Applicants have filed a Notice of Appeal for this matter. A detailed rejection from the Examiner is necessary so that the rejections of the dependent claims can be addressed on appeal and to help the Board of Appeals better

understand the Examiner's reasoning for rejecting the subject matter of each and every dependent claim.

CONCLUSION

Applicants thus respectfully submit that claims 1-10, 15, 19, 20, 22, 23, 30 and 32-35 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this application.

Although the prior art made of record and not relied upon may be considered pertinent to the disclosure, none of these references anticipates or makes obvious the recited aspects of the claims. The fact that Applicants may not have specifically traversed any particular assertion by the Office should not be construed as indicating Applicants' agreement therewith.

Applicants wish to expedite prosecution of this application. If the Examiner deems the application to not be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to telephone the undersigned to discuss making an Examiner's amendment to place the application in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment of any required fee during the entire pendency of this application to Deposit Account No. 19-1345.

Respectfully submitted,

/Frank R. Agovino/

Frank R. Agovino, Reg. No. 27,416
SENNIGER POWERS LLP
100 North Broadway, 17th Floor
St. Louis, Missouri 63102
(314) 231-5400

FRA/DXS/dss